

**Single Family Design Guidelines Update
Neighborhood Preservation Ordinance Update**

Steering Committee

**Meeting #25 Notes
May 20, 2005**

Steering Committee members: Chair Dianne Channing, Vice Chair Brian Barnwell, Joe Guzzardi, Charmaine Jacobs, Bill Mahan, Alex Pujo (attending for Vadim Hsu), Helene Schneider, Richard Six.

Staff: Bettie Weiss (City Planner), Jaime Limón (Supervising Planner), Heather Baker (Project Planner), Jason Smart (Intern).

- I. Welcome and Introductions**
- II. Public Comment for Items Not on the Agenda.** (None)
- III. Administrative Items**
- IV. Issue Paper K: Story Poles**

Staff presentation was followed by Steering Committee discussion. Steering Committee members commented on parts of Issue Paper K, and these comments will be incorporated in a revised version of the document.

Steering Committee discussion was followed by public comment:

Lee Moldaver: Commends Staff on an excellent report and the Steering Committee for a creative discussion. This creative process is fluid and allows back-and-forth. The NPO Update process is founded on four pillars:

- 1) Future workload of Staff
- 2) Workload and number of appeals for review boards
- 3) Trying to be fair and flexible for the hopes and dreams of property owners
- 4) Expectations of neighborhoods and community as a whole.

Although story poles can be costly and inconvenient, they are a good investment because they can benefit the rest of the neighborhood and maintain the integrity and charm of the city as a whole. Noticing prior to hearings is important. Consider the neighborhoods; everyone has their dreams invested in them. Address this with specific, clear, quantifiable and fair rules. The more flexibility and ambiguity there is, the greater the potential for misunderstanding and likelihood of appeals and litigation.

Claudia Madsen: Supports Lee Moldaver's comments. The primary goal of the NPO is to preserve neighborhood character. In the interest of clarity, we need to define what is a substantial reduction of public views. I suggest using the Conservation Element language.

Susan Trescher: Supports Lee Moldaver's comments. Neighbors and the Planning Commission are the ones aided by story poles, not architects. If story poles are not required at the first ABR hearing, then maybe they should be required at the second meeting when revised plans are available.

Connie Hannah: Story poles are beneficial because so many people have trouble visualizing what they read from a description.

Dorothy Fox: Story poles are being used as a punishment. They are unfair to applicants, who are already stretched for money. Neighbors are not the ones who want story poles. There need to be more public meetings at times when the public can attend.

V. FAR Applicability and Standards for > 85% of Max. FAR

Staff presentation was followed by Steering Committee discussion. The Steering Committee made the following comments regarding the most recent draft application routing diagram:

- The “Applicant requests bonus FAR” box should be deleted.
- A footnote should explain that grading under the footprint will now be included in calculations.

Steering Committee discussion was followed by further public comment:

Claudia Madsen: Presented written correspondence dated May 18th.

Connie Hannah: Presented written correspondence dated May 20th.

Timothy Harding: My comments at Meeting #24 were misrepresented in the notes. I not only said that I favor flexibility but that I thought the size limitations the Steering Committee was about to vote on were much too small and unfair to families who want to add to their houses. I did want to emphasize flexibility, but I also wanted to emphasize that the size was too small. I was surprised by the vote, which was the most important part of this process thus far. Two Committee members who previously have said those numbers were too small were not present at the meeting and thus did not have their votes counted. It is very important to have meetings when people can come, as was shown at the Saturday, April 16, meeting. The public needs to be able to provide input on topics before they leave the Committee. It needs to be clear on the website when people can hear the replays of the meetings. Last week’s meeting needs to be widely available. Also, there needs to be proper amplification at meetings, because many audience members cannot hear the Steering Committee members.

The Steering Committee resumed discussion following public comment. Chair Channing designated an Application Routing Steering Subcommittee comprised of the following Steering Committee members, pending their acceptance: Channing, Barnwell, Bartlett, Mahan.

VI. Hillside Design District Boundary Proposals (Issue Paper I)

Postponed.

VII. Options to Address Piecemeal Development Issues (Issue Paper J: Part I)

Not discussed due to lack of time.

VIII. Review Upcoming Schedule

The next Steering Committee meeting was scheduled for June 10th.

IX. Adjourn